

## **REMARKS**

Applicant acknowledges the request for restriction between claims 1-8 identified as Group I, drawn to a composition for a mold used in forming micropatterns and claims 9-11 identified as Group II, drawn to a method for fabricating an organic mold.

Applicant provisionally elects the claims of Group I, as amended, for examination on the merits under 35 USC 121 and 372. The amended claims 1-8 are drawn to an organic mold for forming micropatterns fabricated from a resin composition with the resin composition being identical to that as claimed in the original set of claims 1-8.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement. Applicant telephoned the Examiner, Ryan Ochylski, on December 2, 2008 to indicate that the amended claims filed with the application were apparently overlooked but were submitted with the application as filed to be made of record. The amended claims 1-8 constitute a single general inventive concept involving the same or similar technical features of the method claims 9-11 forming the method for fabricating an organic mold.

The amended claims clearly differentiate the subject invention from the lens sheet of Osawa et al (USP 6,071,443) in that (i) the subject invention is directed to a resin composition for a mold for forming micropatterns to an object i.e. "an organic mold fabricated from a resin composition" and (ii), in terms of its function, the subject organic mold corresponds to the forming dye of Osawa et al rather than to a lens sheet. Moreover, Osawa et al fails to disclose or teach a forming dye prepared using a resin composition as claimed. Both the claims drawn to an organic mold and to a method for fabricating an organic mold respectively, clearly constitute a single general inventive

concept involving the same or similar technical features and, as such, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn. In fact, claim 11, as amended, includes all of the limitations of the composition recited in claim 1.

For all of the above reasons, the restriction under 35 USC 121 should be withdrawn and both groups of claims, Groups I and II, should be examined simultaneously.

Respectfully submitted,


Eugene Lieberstein  
Reg. No. 24,645

Customer # 79681  
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP  
45 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10111  
Tel: 212-589-4634  
Fax: 212-589-4201

**MAILING CERTIFICATE**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent to the USPTO via EFS Web to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450, on December 3, 2008.

By

  
L. Quagliariello